

Serial No. 10/657,781

REMARKS

The Office action dated August 10, 2006 and the cited reference have been carefully considered.

Remarks on the Status of the Office Action

The Applicants note that the Office Action Summary indicates that this is a non-final action. However, the "Conclusion" section of the detailed Office action (page 4), the Examiner indicates that this action is made final. In an earlier telephone call made by the Applicants' attorney to Ms. Corrine McDermott, Ms. McDermott confirmed that this Office action is non-final, as is also shown in PAIR.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-47 are pending. Claims 1-12, 25, 27, 28, and 31-47 are withdrawn pursuant to an earlier election in response to restriction requirement. Therefore, claims 13-24, 26, 29, and 30 remain in the current prosecution.

Claims 13-24, 26, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sheet Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent 6,187,042; hereinafter "Sheet"). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons set forth below.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 13-24, 26, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sheet. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Sheet does not disclose each and every element of each of claims 13-24, 26, 29, and 30.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a *single* prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (emphasis added). "Every element of the claimed invention must be *literally* present, arranged as in the claim. . . . The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in

Serial No. 10/657,781


the . . . claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

Sheet discloses forming a coating on an IOL, which coating comprises at least two aryl acrylic hydrophobic monomers to prevent posterior capsule opacification. See; e.g., abstract and column 2, lines 20-22 and line 41 to column 3, line 3. These aryl acrylic hydrophobic monomers are not blue-light absorbers. When a dye is optionally included, it is polymerized first with said at least two aryl acrylic hydrophobic monomers and the combined material is applied to the IOL. See column 5, lines 4-14. Sheet discloses nothing more about the dye. Thus, Sheet does not disclose explicitly or inherently that reactive groups of the dye material are reacted with the reactive groups of the medical device, as is recited in claims 13-24, 26, 29, and 30.

Since Sheet does not disclose each and every element of each of claims 13-24, 26, 29, and 30, Sheet does not anticipate these claims.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection is requested. Allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Toan P. Vo, Ph.D.
Attorney for the applicants
Registration No. 43,225
585-338-8071

Bausch & Lomb Incorporated
One Bausch & Lomb Place
Rochester, New York 14604
October 9, 2006